DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 088 SP 038 773

AUTHOR Picklesimer, Billie K.; Williams, Jane L.
TITLE School Violence in Japan and the United States: Sharing American Practice with Japanese Teacher Educators.
PUB DATE 1999-08-01
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Japan-United States Teacher Education Consortium (JUSTEC) Conference (Honolulu, HI, August 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counselor Training; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *School Counselors; *Student Behavior; Teachers; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Japan; Middle Tennessee State University; Risk Reduction

ABSTRACT

In December 1998, faculty from Middle Tennessee State University visited the Faculty of Education at Fukushima University in Fukushima, Japan. The purpose of the visit was to share with Japanese educators the processes through which school counselors are trained to deal with school violence in the United States. Because school staffing patterns differ considerably in the two countries in addressing the potential for school violence, Japanese school staff who attended the conference were primarily from three populations: school nurses, homeroom teachers, and retired teachers (none of whom would have been the primary school staff to address the issue of school violence in the United States). This paper describes: (1) school counseling in the United States; (2) the counselor training program at Middle Tennessee State University; (3) developmental school counseling programs; (4) fundamental counselor interventions and staff representation; and (5) concerns regarding staff members who would take on the school counselor role in Japan, counselor training, and the school counselor's effectiveness in dealing with school violence. Two appendixes present core areas in the university's school counseling program and a comparison of U.S. and Japanese school staffing patterns. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 088

School Violence in Japan and the United States:

Sharing American Practice with Japanese Teacher Educators

A Paper Presented at

JUSTEC '99 Conference

Honolulu, Hawai'i

August 1, 1999

Presented by

Billie K. Picklesimer, Assistant Professor

Middle Tennessee State University

Murfreesboro, Tennessee

bpickles *a* frank.mtsu.edu

and

Jane L. Williams, Professor

Middle Tennessee State University

Murfreesboro, Tennessee

jwilliam *a* frank.mtsu.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP038773

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B K Picklesimer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

In December, 1998, faculty from Middle Tennessee State University visited the Faculty of Education at Fukushima University in Fukushima, Japan. The purpose of the visit was to share with Japanese educators the processes through which school counselors are trained in the United States. Because school staffing patterns differ considerably in the two countries in the area of addressing the potential for school violence, participants from both universities were interested to note that school staff who attended the conference were primarily from three populations: school nurses, homeroom teachers, and retired teachers. None of these would have been the primary school staff to address the issue of school violence in the United States. The presenters described the nature of the joint project and the discussions that took place at that conference.

School Violence in Japan and the United States:

Sharing American Practice with Japanese Teacher Educators

Introduction

Middle Tennessee State University in Murfreesboro, Tennessee and Fukushima University in Fukushima, Japan have maintained a partnership of their colleges/faculties of education and business since 1996. In June of that year, the President of Fukushima University and the Dean of MTSU's College of Education signed the partnership agreement at a ceremony that took place in Fukushima.

Since the establishment of the partnership, the two universities have engaged in several joint activities. Each May or June, a group of business students from MTSU goes to Japan for business-related field work, and Fukushima is included in their itinerary. In addition, each year one or more teacher preparation students from Fukushima comes to MTSU for a year of exchange schoolwork.

MTSU's Laboratory School has become partners with the elementary school attached to Fukushima University. The principal of the American lab school has visited the elementary school in Japan, and in September, 1999, the assistant principal of the Japanese school will visit Murfreesboro.

In the summer of 1996, a Fukushima teacher preparation faculty member brought 26 Fukushima University students to MTSU for a 3-week summer course. The students lived in the dormitories during the week, and on weekends they enjoyed home stays with local families. Their coursework in the mornings included local history, American culture, and American teaching methodologies. Afternoons were spend in field trips to area attractions.

Fukushima faculty have obtained two grants that support collaborative efforts with MTSU faculty. One grant, funded by the U.S.-Japan Foundation in New York, supports visits by Japanese teachers over the course of three summers to three sites in the U.S. Their goal is to study American teaching methodologies in the area of environmental pollution/environmental education. Their visit to the U.S. in the summer of 2000 will be to MTSU, where they will study local issues of environmental pollution, observe environmental content-area teaching in local year-round schools, and enjoy home stays with area teachers.

The other grant, begun in 1998 and funded by Monbusho (the Japanese Ministry of Education), supports a three-year project involving a comparative study of school violence in Japan and the U.S. As a part of this effort, each year members of the education faculty of each university travel to the other site for discussions, planning, and home stays. The study will lead toward the development of a joint survey instrument for teachers and parents in schools in both locales, to be administered in the last year of the project, and a comparative analysis of the results.

As a part of this project, in the fall of 1998 two faculty members from Fukushima University visited MTSU and two faculty members from MTSU traveled to Fukushima. The purpose of these visits was to focus on school counseling and special education practices in both countries. The Japanese visitors to MTSU visited elementary and high schools, talked with school counselors, and learned about school counseling education in the U.S. When the MTSU faculty members paid their reciprocal visit to Fukushima, they observed counseling sessions in schools, talked with school nurses and homeroom teachers,

and made presentations to local educators about the American educational system and, specifically, about school counseling.

The remainder of this paper focuses upon the nature of the interactions the two groups have engaged in regarding school counseling. School counseling as it is defined in the United States is a relatively new concept in Japanese schools, and the collaborating faculty from both universities are finding it intriguing to note the similarities and differences in the two systems.

Brief History of U. S. School Counseling

The profession of school counseling in the United States has undergone many changes since the early 1900s. Throughout the decades of the early 1900s to the present day several milestones are noteworthy. In 1913 the National Vocational Guidance Association was formed and this organization has been identified as the founder of school guidance. The testing movement of the 1920s that stressed the measurement of personality traits continued through the early 1950s. During this decade the term "mental health" was introduced which lead to the call for more psychological services and trained professionals (Myrick, 1997). In the 1950s three professional organizations were formed: (a) the American Personnel and Guidance Association, now known as the American Counseling Association; (b) the American Psychological Association; and (c) the American School Counselor Association.

The passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was an instrumental event in the history of school counseling. This bill recognized the value of counseling in schools, provided funds for the training of school counselors, and gave

credibility that a trained professional was needed in the schools. Counselor education departments in colleges and universities began to emerge to train counselors to work at the secondary level. Early counselor preparation was often inadequate since no one was clear exactly what counselors should do. Without well-defined counselor preparation and the uncertainty of counselor roles, these "guidance counselors" often drifted into quasi-administrative positions (Myrick, 1997).

In 1965 an extension of the NDEA Act provided support for the growth and development of elementary school counselors. The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) issued guidelines for the preparation of high school counselors in 1967 and in 1968 expanded those guidelines for elementary school counselor preparation. By 1979 standards had been established for the preparation of school counselors by colleges and universities and in 1981 the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) was established to evaluate counselor preparation programs.

The continued influence of ASCA, CACREP, and state-specific school counseling legislative action over the past couple of decades has lead to quality counselor education programs in the United States. The emergence and growth of comprehensive, developmental school counseling programs is the direct result of this continued influence.

Counselor Training Program at Middle Tennessee State University

CACREP programs and those modeled after CACREP standards cover content in the following eight core areas: (a) human growth and development; (b) social and cultural foundations; (c) helping relationships; (d) group work; (e) career and lifestyle development; (f) appraisal; (g) research and program evaluation; and (h) professional

orientation. An explanation of courses relevant to Middle Tennessee State University's training program is included in Appendix A (Dansby & Picklesimer, 1998). At Middle Tennessee State University, it typically takes students three years to complete their course work and internships. Students who wish to obtain employment as a school counselor after graduation must be licensed to do so by the State Board of Education. Graduates from CACREP or CACREP model programs are recognized as highly qualified professionals.

Developmental School Counseling Programs

Although the history of the school counseling profession has undergone many changes, it should be noted that even today many counseling programs in U. S. public schools are still undergoing the transformation from "guidance programs" to comprehensive, developmental school counseling programs. According to the American School Counselor Association's Governing Board school counseling is

> a process of helping people by assisting them in making decisions and changing behavior. School counselors work with all students, school staff families, and members of the community as an integral part of the education program. School counseling programs promote school success through a focus on academic achievement, prevention and intervention activities, advocacy and social/emotional and career development (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 8).

The Tennessee School Counseling Program: A Framework for Action (Tennessee Department of Education, 1997) was compiled in September, 1997, to serve as a model for school counseling programs in the state. This framework was based on the American School Counselor Association's national standards for school counseling programs

(Campbell & Dahir, 1997), the model set forth by Gysbers and Henderson (1994), and other state department of education guidelines. The school counseling framework was developed to insure implementation of the following: (a) to reach all students; (b) to provide a programmatic approach to the school counseling services; (c) to implement a written curriculum to address student needs; (d) to plan for accountability of services; (e) to identify counseling and non-counseling tasks; (f) to address student needs rather than "scheduling needs"; and (g) to identify counselor/student ratios (Tennessee Department of Education, 1997).

The Tennessee School Counseling Framework components include the following four areas: (a) school counseling curriculum to include structured groups and classroom guidance activities; (b) individual planning to include advisement, assessment, placement, and follow-up; (c) responses services to include individual counseling, small group counseling, consultation, and referral; and (d) program support to include professional development, program management, consultation, community outreach, and public relations.

Fundamental Counselor Interventions and Staff Representation

While the Tennessee School Counseling Framework outlined four components for school counseling programs, Myrick (1997) identified six fundamental interventions that are a part of a comprehensive developmental school counseling program. These include: (a) individual counseling, (b) small group counseling, (c) classroom guidance, (d) peer facilitation, (e) consultation, and (f) coordination. The school counselor in the United States, together with the cooperation and involvement of all school personnel, is primarily

responsible for the above six counselor interventions. As the authors visited Japanese schools, it *appeared* that these roles, when applicable, were the responsibility of different school staff--basically school nurses and homeroom teachers. It further appeared that these professionals were assisted, at times, by curriculum coordinators, principals, vice principals, and retired teachers. Appendix B notes how the school counseling staffing patterns appear to differ between the two countries, while in a general way accommodating student needs in both situations. In both systems, the main issue is *how* staff collaborate to identify and deal with student concerns. Such approaches will undoubtedly differ according to school structure, staff training, student concerns, and cultural characteristics.

Concerns

As stated earlier, attendees at the December conference at Fukushima University were primarily from three populations: school nurses, homeroom teachers, and retired teachers. Several concerns were raised by the audience. A major concern was which staff member in Japanese schools would take on the school counselor role as outlined in the U.S. system. There was no immediate identifiable answer as the two educational systems obviously differ in many ways. As school counselor training programs expand in Japanese universities, the counselor role will need to be identified so as to meet the school's concerns.

The issue of training was the second concern of the attendees. School counselor training can be quite extensive and costly to universities and students alike. Federal funds have expanded school counseling training programs in the U.S. Perhaps similar programs could be developed in Japan to facilitate the training and placement of counselors, or an identified counterpart, into the schools. Implementing a developmental school counseling

program takes a great deal of time, effort, support, and commitment on behalf of many individuals. Making this transition involves careful planning, design, delivery of services, and evaluation of the program. During this challenging period, the following three questions should be examined and re-examined: (a) Where are we now? (b) Where do we want to be? and (c) How can we get where we want to be? These questions become paramount as school professionals, in Japan and the U.S., consider the necessity of addressing issues and developing effective programs to address the issue of school violence. Furthermore, school counselors, or their counterparts, must address issues of program accountability that include identifying the needs of the total school community, providing services and interventions to meet the identified needs, and evaluating the effectiveness of the counseling program (Myrick, 1997).

The last major concern of the attendees involved the school counselor's effectiveness in dealing with the issue of school violence. There is no quick, easy response to this concern. Violence has increased within the school setting and reduction of this problem must come from many domains. It behooves school counselors, or those who assume the counseling role in schools, to approach their school administration and lobby for the opportunity to develop a comprehensive, developmental school program. If allowed to address the six counselor interventions on a daily basis, the effectiveness of the school counseling program could certainly enhance the school community. While school counselors, or their counterparts, are not the sole answer to reducing student concerns, effective school counseling programs would, without a doubt, be one avenue to address school violence.

References

Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). The national standards for school counseling programs (Prepublication Copy). Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Dansby, V. S., & Picklesimer, B. K. (1998). Handbook for the master's degree in school counseling, Middle Tennessee State University. Unpublished manual, Middle Tennessee State University at Murfreesboro.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (1994). Developing and managing your school guidance program (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Myrick. R. D. (1997). Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.

Tennessee Department of Education. (1997). Tennessee school counseling program: A framework for action. Nashville, TN: Tennessee Department of Education.

Appendix A

MTSU Masters of Education, School Counseling Program (Pre K-12) Core Areas

Human Growth and Development--6 semester hours

PSY 525	Psychology of Exceptional Children *or*
SPED 680	Exceptional Children &Youth *or*
PSY 640	Psychological Disorders of Children
PSY 612	Developmental Psychology: Child *or*
PSY 613	Developmental Psychology: Adolescent

Social and Cultural Foundations--3 semester hours

PSY 572	Multicultural Perspectives in Psychology & Education *or*
PSY 710	Multicultural & Social Bases for Assessment & Intervention Practices
	or
SOC 524	Race & Ethnic Relations *or*
FOED 685	Minority Groups

The Helping Relationship--18 semester hours

PSY 547	Theories of Counseling
PSY 626	Pre-Practicum in School Counseling
PSY 627A	Practicum: School Counseling
PSY 681D	Internship: Secondary School Counseling
PSY 681E	Internship: Elementary School Counseling
PSY 689	Consultation

Groups--4 semester hours

PSY 617	Group Counseling & Psychotherapy
PSY 617L	Laboratories in Psychology: Group Counseling

Life Style and Career Development--3 semester hours

PSY 615	Career Counseling

Appraisal--3 semester hours

PSY 526	Introduction to Psychological Testing *or*
PSY 605	Psychological Testing

Reserach and Evaluation--3 semester hours

PSY 661	Introduction to Educational & Psychological Research

Professional Orientation--9 semester hours

PSY 616	Foundations of School Counseling
PSY 622	Organization & Administration of School Counseling Services
PSY 623	Legal & Ethical Issues in School Counseling

Source: Dansby & Picklesimer, 1998

Appendix B

Comparison of U.S. and Japanese School Staffing Patterns

U. S. System	Japanese System
Individual Counseling	**Individual Counseling**
* school counselor	* school nurse
* teacher (on occasion)	* homeroom teacher
* school psychologist (on occasion)	* psychiatrist (grant)
Small Groups	**Small Groups**
* school counselor	* psychiatrist (grant)
* school psychologist (on occasion)	* school nurse
Classroom Guidance	**Classroom Guidance**
* school counselor	
* teacher (on occasion)	
Peer Facilitation	**Peer Facilitation**
* school counselor	
Consultation	**Consultation**
* school counselor	* homeroom teacher
* school psychologist	* school nurse
* teacher	* principal
* principal	* vice principal
* assistant principal	
Coordination	**Coordination**
* school counselor	* homeroom teacher
* guidance committee	* school nurse